Atty. Dkt. No. 10018307-1

REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Final Office Action mailed on April 6, 2006 in which Claims 1-31 were rejected. This reply is filed with a request for continuing examination. With this response, Claims 1, 9, 16, 23, 24 and 25 are amended and Claims 32-34 are added. Claims 1-34, as amended, are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I.   Examiner Interview Summary.

On June 1, 2006, a telephonic interview was held between Examiner Pokrzywa and Applicants attorney, Todd A. Rathe. The rejection of claims 1, 9, 16, and 23-25 based upon Smith US Patent Publication 2002/0113994 was discussed. The meaning of the term "archive file" was discussed. It was tentatively agreed upon that amendments to the claims to specify that the archive file is a document (compressed or uncompressed) rather than simply a Web address or that amendments to the claims reciting that the print request is transmitted to the mobile device and that the archive file is transmitted from the archive device would overcome rejection based upon Smith.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Pokrzywa for the opportunity to discuss the rejections and for the examiners suggestions for amending the claims to overcome prior art rejection.

II.   Rejection of Claims 1-31 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Based Upon Smith.

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith II, et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0113994. Claims 1, 9, 16 and 20 3-25 are amended. Claims 1-31, as amended, overcome the rejection based on Smith.

A.   Claims 1 and 23.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method of printing using a mobile device. The method includes accessing remote content including a document, generating on

-9-

Atty. Dkt. No. 10018307-1

the mobile device an archive file containing the document, transmitting a print request to an imaging device, receiving a file request from the imaging device for the archive file and transmitting the archive file to the imaging device, whereby the imaging device prints the content. .

Claim 23 recites a computer program product for mobile printing wherein the steps recited in Claim 1 are embodied as code in a computer readable medium comprising at least one of hardware and software.

Smith fails to disclose a method of printing using a mobile device wherein remote content including a document is accessed and an archive file containing the document is generated on the mobile device. Smith fails to disclose receiving a file request from the imaging device for the archive file or transmitting the archive file to the imaging device. In contrast, in the method disclosed by Smith, the mobile device merely receives truncated information which serves as an identification tag for full-length information on a server. The truncated information, serving as an identification tag, merely allows the portable device to identify to the server what full-information on the server should be sent to a printer by the server. (See ¶¶ 19-22 and 45-48 of Smith.)

In response to Applicants' previous arguments, the Office Action acknowledges that only a web address for web page is sent. Smith does not appear to disclose transmitting the full web page. In contrast, Smith merely describes a print by reference process similar to what is already described in paragraph 5 under the heading "Introduction" in the present application.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 23, as amended, overcome the rejection based on Smith. Claims 2-8 and 26 depend from Claim 1 and overcome the rejection based upon Smith for the same reasons.

B.   Claims 9 and 24.

Claim 9, as amended, recites a method of printing using a mobile service. The method includes accessing remote content including a document, generating on

-10-

Atty. Dkt. No. 10018307-1

a proxy server an archive file containing the document, receiving a file request at the proxy server from the imaging device for the archive file and transmitting the archive file from the proxy server to the imaging device, whereby the imaging device prints the content of the archive file.

Claim 24 recites a computer program product embodied in a computer readable medium comprising at least one of software and hardware, wherein the medium includes code embodying the same steps as recited in Claim 9.

Smith fails to disclose the method recited in Claim 9 or the computer program product of Claim 24. Smith fails to disclose a method of printing using a mobile device wherein an archive file containing a document of the remote content is generated on a proxy server and transmitted from the proxy server to an imaging device or wherein the file request is received at the proxy server from the imaging device for the archive file. In contrast, Smith discloses that its server generates truncated information which merely serves as an identification tag. This truncated information does not appear to be a document. Moreover, Smith does not disclose that this truncated information is transmitted from the proxy server to an imaging device or printer. Rather, only the formatted full-length information is sent from the server to the printer. Moreover, nowhere does Smith disclose that its server receives a file request from an imaging device or printer. Accordingly, Claims 9 and 24, as amended come overcome the rejection based upon Smith. Claims 10-15 and 27 depend from Claim 9 and are patentable distinct over Smith for the same reasons.

C.   Claims 16 and 25.

Claim 16, as amended, recites a method of printing using a mobile device. The method includes generating on a proxy server an archive file containing a document of the remote content, receiving a file request from the imaging device for the archive file, transmitting the file request to the proxy server and streaming the archive file from the mobile device to the imaging device, whereby the imaging device prints the content.

-11-

Atty. Dkt. No. 10018307-1

Claim 25 recites a computer program product embodied in a computer readable medium comprising at least one of software and hardware, wherein the computer readable medium includes code for performing the method steps recited in Claim 16.

Smith fails to disclose a method of printing using a mobile device which includes generating on a proxy server an archive file containing a document of the remote content, receiving a file request from the imaging device for the archive file or streaming a data stream of the archive file from the mobile device to the imaging device, whereby the imaging device prints the document. In contrast, Smith discloses a process wherein the server truncates or compresses information (see ¶ 45) and wherein the truncated information merely serves as an identification tag for the portable device to select printing of particular information. Once the truncated information is selected, the truncated information is transmitted to the server which then transmits the formatted full-length information to a printer (see ¶¶ 47 and 48). Accordingly, claims 16 and 25, as amended come overcome the rejection based upon Smith. Claims 17-22 and 28 depend from Claim 16 and overcome the rejection based upon Smith for the same reasons.

D.   Claims 3, 10 and 17.

Claims 3, 10 and 17 depend from Claims 1, 9 and 16, respectively, and recite that the remote content comprises a web page containing a link to a reference content and that the step of generating an archive file comprises rewriting the link to refer to a reference content file in the archive file.

Smith fails to disclose generating an archive file which includes rewriting the link to reference content in a web page which would refer to reference content file in the archive file. The Office Action refers to paragraphs 40 and 41 in its rejection of Claims 3, 10 and 17. However, nowhere do paragraphs 40 and 41 describe the generation of an archive file or wherein generating the archive file includes rewriting a link to reference content on a web page to refer to reference content file in the

-12-

Atty. Dkt. No. 10018307-1

archive file. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 3, 10 and 17 should be withdrawn for this additional reason.

III.   Added Claims.

With this response, Claims 32-34 are added. Claims 32-34 are believed to be patentably distinct over the prior art of record.

A.   Claims 32 and 33

Claims 32 and 33 depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively and are patentable distinct of the prior art of record for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 9. Claims 32 and 33 further recite that the document is a markup language document.

Smith of the disclose that the document is a markup language document. In contrast, Smith merely discloses a Web address. A Web address is not a markup language document. A Web address does not contain links to other documents. Thus, claims 32 and 33 are presented for consideration and allowance.

B.   Claim 34

Added claim 34 constitutes former claim 26 rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of its former base claim 1. Claimed 34 recites that the mobile device receives the file request from the imaging device for their archive file and transmits the archive file to the imaging device. As noted above, during the Examiner interview held on June 1, 2006, it was tentatively agreed upon that specifying that it is the mobile device that receives the file request from the imaging device and it is the mobile device that transmits the archive file to the imaging device would overcome the rejection based upon Smith. Upon further review, it was noticed that claim 26 already recited such limitations. Accordingly, former claim 26 is rewritten as added claim 34 and is presented for consideration and allowance.

-13-

Atty. Dkt. No. 10018307-1

IV.   Conclusion.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-34 are now pending in this application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date __June 8, 2006__   By __Todd A. Rathe__

RATHE PATENT & IP LAW   Todd A. Rathe
Customer No. 22879   Attorney for Applicant
Telephone: (262) 478-9353   Registration No. 38,276
Facsimile: (262) 238-1469

-14-